G R S. IX-5]

*Previous references.*

1877
~~191~~ .
( Jn l )

File No. 38-

Serial Nos. 1-

*Later references.*

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

---

*Serial Nos.* 1 to 15

**Part B for** January 1900.

---

SUBJECT.

Sale of a piece of land to the South of Kumbargund Seeramani Munisamappa & 5 Bangalore

---

Indexed
MM.
[illegible]

W D 83—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

Precis of correspondence in the matter of Seeramani Munisamappa's claim to certain land situated to the South of Kumbargundi main drain in the Bangalore City

---

Sl 4 An order (Re 190 dt 19-5-84) was issued to Seeramani Munisamappa by the then Municipal President to the effect, that as a portion of his land was required for Municipal purposes, viz for storing up manure, and as he had agreed to take up the land offered by the Municipality in exchange he might take possession of the land marked B in the plan in lieu of B belonging to the

Sl 3

petitioner and of which the
Municipality had taken
possession.

On 25-3-94 he submitted a
petition to the Municipality stating
that the land given in exchange
for his land taken up by the
Municipality was less in extent
by 5657 sft, that in spite of
it, he had been paying Kandayan
for the land thus taken over
by the municipality, ever since
the transfer, & that the then
Vice President had promised
to return the land to him
again when the same would
no longer be required by the
Municipality and praying
that as the said land had not
been utilized, the same might
be returned to him and
that the land marked C
might also be allowed to remain
in his possession in consideration
of his having paid the Kandayan

(3) for the excess extent above referred to and as he has improved the same by making a well therein &c.

(3) On this petition the following resolutions of the Board are recorded. (1) Muniswami has no right to ask for the restoration of the land, as compensation both in land & in money was paid (2) this application cannot be granted as the land may be required for the municipality. Two Karnams endorsements were granted to Peter & Ramaswamy in one of which he was simply informed that he had no right to ask for the return of the land nor had he any right to claim it and that the Board would not give it as requested by him, the other endorsement also was in terms of the Board's resolution

S(5

(Rama-swamy, (~~Petitioner~~ another applicant for same land)

Nos 131 & 132 of 26-9-94

S(6 J

For a subsequent election
of 22. 8 95; he represented that
as he was the holder of the
land in the possession of the
Municipality & as he had
been possessed hereof,
the Local authorities had
been compelling him to re-
store the channels in it which
the municipal authorities
had neglected to maintain
and pray[illegible] that the land
might be restored to him &
enable him to build up the
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

an oral agreement that if the land should become vacant, it would be returned to him, that he had been paying the Kandayam of the land from that time though the same was in the enjoyment of the municipality, and praying that the said land might be sold to him for cultivation purposes. He also added that if the same would be required by the municipality at any time, he would give it back after taking back from the municipality the price paid for it together with the cost incurred them in connection with its improvement

(4) An endorsement was given to the petitioner to the effect that the land would not be

No 1137 07 & 5 97
5(1)

was held but that a month's
notice should be given at the rate of
£10 a month.

The defendant in subsequently
[illegible] (12
[illegible] stated that the land
in question was neither a
building nor a public place
but a piece of a monthly
tenancy being reserved thereon
and prayed that the same
might be given to him on
certain terms for a year

The endorsement was given
to him that if he did not
agree to take up the land
on the terms therein offered he must quit on the [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

On a motion to discharge
the order referred to the jurisdiction
of the Court.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

in public auction, the Presi-
dent reserving to himself
the right of accepting or
rejecting any bid.

(6) The land was accordingly
sold by the Collector on 25-11-37
after going through the necessary
formalities of issuing a procla-
mation &.

(7) On the sale, the ~~property was~~
~~knocked down~~ highest bid
~~of the highest bid was~~
was ~~the petitioner~~ for Rs 1025;
and was offered by ~~A~~ Petr, who
~~He~~ immediately deposited a
fourth of the purchase money
viz Rs 256-4-0

(8) on the Collector's report about
the sale the President passed
an order that he would not
confirm the sale, that he
had an offer of Rs 1125 &
that as the land was
Very valuable he would not
accept any thing less than
Rs 1200.

5l 16?

and that the deposit amount should be returned to the party. ~~It was returned accdly~~

Seeramani Inquiry, the petitioner was sent for and asked whether he would pay Rs 1200 for the land, which he declined.

The deposit amount was returned to the petitioner.

(9) The Petr appeals against this order.

Orig 16/4/70

SBK
14.4.98

~~Author Author~~

Does an appeal lie to Govt under the above Regulations? 4
18/4/98

7

Keeps: geevey

Does an appeal lie out under the Municipal Regulations

Memo

(10) The Municipal Regulations provide for no appeals except in the case of rates or taxes assessed by the Municipal and that to the Chief Judge Commissioners, (Vide sec 78).

But it is respectfully submitted that though there is no appeal to Commissioners under the Regulations the action of the President or of the Board is subject to the general control of the Court and that in several cases appeals in respect of building sites in the town as well as in the western extension were received in this office and orders passed by Court.

(11) The site in question, an agricultural land, which had formerly belonged to the appellant and used by him for garden cultivation was acquired by the Municipality for a public depôt and when no longer required the same was ~~disposed of~~ let to public

auction.

in person praying that
orders may be issued to have
the site resold by public
auction or to have the first
sale confirmed ~~and~~ or that if
a reasonable price be fixed
by Govt. the Petitioner, who
is an hackdar for the land,
is prepared to purchase the same
~~as~~ on payment of such
price

Submitted EMJ 29/4/98

(157 In Feb 1914 the Board
declined to grant the
land in question
to Peter Dane
Ramaswami as it might
be required for school
purposes. There is
nothing to show that
this resolution was
subsequently cancelled
by the Board - The
President however
ordered the sale of
the land. It is true
that the usual con-
dition was not

in the sale. proclama-
tion - Chief Justice
motion making a
cancellation of the sale
in the absence of any
material irregularity
either in publishing
or conducting it -
The Debt was also
that the owners
this land - As such
sale is regular on
its face - that
due notice
that may be
evident that he
offered the highest
bid at the sale,
the amount bid
being $1,025 - the
circumstance that
some other person
afterwards bid the
property that he
cannot now a ground
sufficient for the
Court on that the
President - Mr. Justice
Next the Court would
month to [illegible]

not an adequate
Justification for
the refusal to con-
firm the sale &
give effect to it -
After all the differen
between the highest
bid & the President's
Valuation were not
considerable the
Presidents discretion
was subject to the
general control of
Court - & the Board
did not want the law
of Question for much
purpose
Reasons the President
should & might
be asked to give
effect to the sale
at a sum which the Rules
left the highest
bidder -

Filed 2d Rec'd
Eastern Dist

2/15/93 -

(6) The above is dup

2729

15

11136

1897-8
20-16-985-98

From

The President,

Bangalore City Municipality.

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore

Dated 17. Genl & Rev. Dept.

Despatched 18. Bangalore

Received June '98

General No. 263

No.

Enclosure No. 816

Soliciting reconsideration of the orders contained in the Govt Proceedings No 15172 F.F. 303-96 dtd 4th May 98 re. the Grant of land to one Seshamma Alumi Samanbhat.

To Secretary
for orders write

9.J 21/6/98

send the order referred to
President, the whole
was thoroughly gone into
clearly recognized that
ramappa had a just prior
the land in question. He
highest bidder at the
sale and he was also the
al owner of the land. It
therefore be said that he
a right on considerations of
law & equity. ~~It is difficult~~
~~why~~ the proper sale to him for Rs
as cancelled and the land
another for a slightly higher
nt. It is difficult to see
the present request of the
nt for a reconsideration
der can be properly com-
with.

BR
22/6/98

I have
as follows
Esqre
City

"With reference to
reference from the Honble
request that the
sent may be
so much of
mentioned may
last as the follow-
Facts

(1) Relates to the sale
-ration to the land
as held by
(2) Mean of
held by
me than or how,

Lbm 24/6/98

16

(3) Ou nouvelle
ligne pour chaque
élément.

24/09/98

K-mod. B-724/1, 8th ed.

16) The above orders having been communicated to the Presidency in Proc no 15·122/303-96 Dy 19/5/98 (& Peta having been informed that the former were ordered to give effect to the sale if the Board did not require the land for municipal purposes) the President reported that

Sl 11

Koonappa, to whom the land in question was sold for Rs 1200, paid the amount on 28th March 1898, and was put in possession of the land and requested a ~~for a~~ reconsideration of the orders issued.

(17) Thereupon the President was requested to submit very early information on the following points

(1) What is the date on

(Sl 10)

reconsideration of the order is now under reference.

It is submitted that the facts noted above go clearly against the recommendation made by the President for a confirmation of the sale to ~~the~~ the subsequent purchaser.

BBL
21/7/98

The report called for by Govt was delayed for a considerable time & the land was otherwise disposed of when that report was rec- No mention of such disposal was made in the report subsequently called. When the Govt passed the order of 19th Sept, it was under the impression that the Municipality was in occupation of the land- But it now seems and that it had already changed hands. The President's action has placed the Govt in an awkward position - There are no grounds for a reconsideration of the order passed by Govt- but the enforcement of that order does not seem feasible without expressing the Govt to a suit by the purchaser.

E. Duke
21/7/98

I do not see any reason for reviving the original order. I would say that the President should have intimated the fact of his having put the purchaser in possession & then he made the report on the petitioners complaint- 7 days subsequent to the giving the petitioner such possession the Govt passed the order

Cannot be upheld
Mandlik
21/7/98
Chitnavis

Sept 19th 98 - 2
3/10/98

No 1729

Rect
To Parker Pen
3-1-98

2R stamps affixed

EVANS STORY
DEPARTMENT
1729 R
3-1-98

ಸಾಗರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಚೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 30 ರಂದು

25 8786 £:54

No. 303-96 ae Petn:

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE. 28/1/98

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

2L1540 38-98

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1729 £15·31
dated 27 December 1897 received at the
Dewan's Office from Swamma Moone-
Sawmappa, Bangalore, complaining
against the order of the
President of the City municipal
~~council~~ ~~to order~~ directing
Pets to take back the deposit
~~of deposit~~ loaded by him in respect
of price of land sold to him by public auction
is forwarded, together with its five
enclosures, to the President of the
~~City~~ Municipality for a report ~~as to~~
stating the facts, Special reference
to the records with regard to
the petitioner's allegations that the land
was not offered to him overequally with
~~accepted from~~ ~~belonged to~~ him and that the
late Vice President announced to
him ~~that he~~ would not ~~be~~ longer require
it to ~~by the Municipality~~ and that
he bid for As 1025 was the highest
at the auction sale of the land
held on 25/11/97 ~~and the deposit~~
~~of 10% was~~ By order,

28-1-98

Secretary

BANGALORE,
28/1/1898

28/1/98

74

12597 6

From 6 The President,
Bangalore Municipality.




To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore
Genl & Rev. Dept
Bangalore

Dated
Despatched
Received
General No. 206 April 98
No. Genl
38-98
Enclosure No.
6 2

Subject Submitting records connected with the sale of a piece of land to the South of Kumbargundi to Seramane Muniswamy Shenoy

Case Volume Miscs - II
9-4-98

Submitted
12
4 98

Dept 4 Pol 58

3/1/98
Submitted for orders.
Refer in copy of his letter to the Taluk Tahsildar (address) to enquire and report in the matter for the information of this Govt. stating whether the land in question is Government property or not and if so whether it is required for any public purpose or not.

25

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION

No. 206 / Eu J

City Bangalore, 4th April 1898.

From

The President, Municipal Commission,
Bangalore City.

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General & Revenue Departt.
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your Officials Memoranda Nos 8786-9482 dated 28th January and 11th February 1898 & F 303-96 respectively, I have the honor to submit herewith the records connected with the sale of Municipal land lying to the south of Kumbar Gundi and to state that so far back as 1884 a piece of land belonging to Petitioner Sirnivasa Munivannappa and marked B

the Municipality in exchange
of the one granted to him and
marked C. This was done with
the Consent of the Petitioner, as
will be seen from Copy of Endorse-
-ment No 190 dated 19th May 1886
granted to him and there is
nothing to show that any promise
was ever made to him to return
this land if, in future, it was
not required by the Municipality.
If, as alleged by the Petitioner,
any such promise had actu-
-ally been made he would have
been the last person to bid for
the land during the recent sale
in public auctions.

2. With regard to his allegation
that his bid for Rs 1025/- was

-the

highest at the auction sale held on the 25th November 1897, I beg to state that it is a fact, I did not confirm the sale as I considered the land very valuable and should have fetched a higher price. The sale was moreover held subject to the condition that the rights of accepting or rejecting any bid was specially reserved.

3. The enclosures to the two memoranda under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt Servant

PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE CITY.

Section - Rev.

38-98

Read -

Letter dtd 20th dated 4 April 1898 from the President Bangalore City Municipality, submitting the report called for in Official Memorandum dtd 28th January & 17th July 1898 respectively in pleg and to the appeal of Mr Sreeman Mums. annappa against the order of the President cancelling the sale of a certain land in the City

R 2440

15122
L.J. 303-96 8/9/5/98

In: one file of records to Pdt.

Order thereon

It is observed that in Sept 1894 the Municipal Board decline to grant the land in question to Petitioner and one Ramaswamy, as it might be required for municipal purposes. The Board considered that There is nothing to shew that this resolution was subsequently cancelled by the Board The President however

ordered the sale of the
land. The insertion of the
usual condition in the
sale proclamation ~~should~~ would not a sufficient
warrant for the cancelment of
~~the~~ the sale in the absence
of any material irregularity
either in ~~the~~ publishing or
conducting it. ~~The~~ At the Petitioners
was at one time the owner
of this land, ~~and as such~~
some special consideration
~~was due~~ is fairly due to him.
However that may be, it
is evident that he offered
the highest bid at the
sale, the amount thereof
being Rs 1025/-. The circumstance
that some other person
afterwards ~~bid~~ offered ~~the~~ Petitioner
~~to pay~~ Rupees
more

a little over the highest bid

Ral
V: 38-97
5

L. 2447.

15123 19/5/98
L7.303—96
In: 5

Endorsement: £153 1s £617½
Lewamani Moneesamy &c:
Sirs is informed that the
President has been directed
to give effect to the sale,
the ~~Board does not propose~~ Board do not
propose the land for municipal
purposes. Encls. are herewith returned

move for the ~~Land~~ 30 that
the President thought that the
land was worth Rs 1200, & is was
not an adequate justification
for the refusal to confirm the
sale & ~~give effect to it~~. The
President is therefore requested
to give effect to the sale, at
which Peter was the highest
bidder, if the Board do not
require the land in question
for municipal purposes.

BR. 17/5/98.

C 17-5-98
Secy

To

The President, Bangalore City &c,
Returning the file of record
received with the letter read above

11136
L 2723 31

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,

No 263 *City Bangalore,* 17th June 1898

*From*

*The President, Municipal Commission,*
*Bangalore City.*

Rd 38-97 6

*To* The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Genral & Revenue Depttt
Bangalore

SIR,

Adverting to Government
10) Proceedings No 15122 dated 19th
L.7303-96
May '98, I have the honor to state
that Koonappa to whom the land
in question was sold for Rs 1200/-
has paid the amount on the
28th March '98 and possession of
the land has been given to him.
This man has incurred an expendi-
-ture of Rs 200/- in effecting some
improvements thereon and it would
manifestly be unfair to deprive
him of the land and [illegible] claim

been a great injustice. I therefore solicit that Government may be pleased to reconsider the order contained in the Proceedings quoted above.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obt servant

T. T. Leonard

PRESIDENT, MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE, CITY.

Dec 21,

33 / 2 issue today. 16 (12)

19

From The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore
Mil. & Rev Depts.

38-99

to The President;
Bangalore City Mtg

Dated 24
Despatched June 1898
Received 27-6-98

General No. 16937
L F No. 308-96

Enclosure No.

His letter No 263 of 17 June
Soliciting reconsideration
of the order of Govt of the 19
May 1898 rejecting her
to give effect to the sale of
certain land in the City at which Nonnamma was the
highest bidder

---

With reference to the
above I am the honour to
request that the President
will be good enough

report on the following points

(1) What was the date on which the land was sold to Kaoniappa ?

(2) Was it sold by public auction or how ?

(3) On what date was possession given to him ?

By Order

24/6/98

for Secretary

ony 24/6/98

3

OFFICE [illegible]

502

1898

From Secretary

The President,

Bangalore City Municipality.

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Pub & Rev Dept

Dated 16th

Despatched

Received

General No. 8

No.

Bangalore July 98

Enclosure No.

Submitting reports on the vacant lands near Kumbargoondi granted to one Konappa.

47
19 7 98

Submitted 20/7/98

36

No. 8

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
*City Bangalore,* 16th July 1898

*From*

*The President, Municipal Commission,*
*Bangalore City.*

8

*To* The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General & Revenue Depth
Bangalore.

SIR,

(12) Adverting to your Docket
No. 16937
L.F.303-96 dated 24th June 1898, I have
the honor to state that the land in
question was sold to Koonappah
on the 3rd March 1898 and possession
thereof given to him on the 28th idem.
The land was not sold in public
auction but was granted on the
application of Koonappah.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt servt

PRESIDENT MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE CITY.

Encl

37

Read: —

Letter No. 8 dated 16th July 98 from the President, Bangalore City Municipality requesting reconsideration of the order passed by Govt. in their Pro: No 15122 / L.7 303-96 dt 19th May 98 confirming the sale by auction of certain land near Kumbargudi in the City at which Sriniwasa Nunisamappa was the highest bidder.

Order thereon: —

It is observed that on a complaint of the pet Nunisamappa, Govt called for a report from the President. This report was delayed for a considerable time and the land in question was otherwise disposed of when it was still due. In the report which was subsequently submitted there was no mention of such disposal and Govt passed their order of 19th May 98 in the belief that the Municipality was in possession of the land & now transpires that it had already

Changed hands. 37

The President failed to intimate the fact of his having put the 2nd purchaser in possession of the land when the report on the petr's complaint was submitted, seven days subsequent to ~~the~~ giving the 2nd purchaser such possession. Under these circumstances Govt regret that the action of the President cannot be upheld and they further do not see any reason for revising the original order.

8-8

BR.
5/8/98

Secretary

To:
The President. Bangalore
City Municipality

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN MYSORE.
5631
1898-99
15-12-99

L.957

(14)

39

From

THE PRESIDENT,

*Bangalore City Municipality.*

*To:*

THE SECRETARY TO THE

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,

*General and Revenue Departments,*

BANGALORE.

*Dated* 10

*Despatched* 13 December 99

*Received*

General No. 98 } 38-99
No. 10

*Enclosure No.* 1

Submitting for sanction a Refund Bill for Rs 1200/- payable to the heirs of one Kumaraiah

Office of the Municipal Commission,

City, Bangalore, 10th December 1898.
13

No. 98
Enclosure
From

8(10

THE PRESIDENT,
MUNICIPAL COMMISSION,
BANGALORE CITY.

To The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
General Revenue Dept.
Bangalore

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No. 1966 / 273-98 dated 10 August 1898 declining to revise the order conveyed in Proceedings No. 15122 / 1730 3-98 of 19th May 1898 Calling upon the Board to give effect to the sale of a site of Municipal land, both originally on the 25th November 1897, and in which Sir Ramaswamy Mudaliar purchased the land for Rs 1250 / I have the honour to submit here-

41

for favour of sanction a refund bill for Rs 1200/- payable to the heirs of one Kunnappa to whom the said land was sold at the second sale on the 3rd March 1898 for the above amount before the receipt of the Government Order above quoted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

K. Matthewman
President

WK

1898-99 (15)

42

From

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

General and Revenue Depts.

To

The President of the Bangalore City Municipality

Dated

Despatched 23rd Dec 1899

Received

General No. 7312 & 7947

L. D. 5-98

Enclosure No.

the same

Sir 115-97 8/1/00 L 1106

His Letter No 9897 10-12-99 Subg for Sanction a refund Bill for Rs 1200 payable to the heirs of one Kunnappa, to whom certain piece of land was sold at the Second Sale held on the 3rd March 1898, in pursuance of ~~which was~~ ~~Sanction~~ cancelled in Govt. Rso. No 15-122 dated 19.5.98 ~~No 2303-96~~

To enable Govt. to pass final order on the case, the President is requested to report wherein the price of the land was received from Sironami Moonecawmapha and

and if so when &
what. Read.

By Order

21-12

for Secretary

S.M. 18/12

men in
of the
in the Refund
Probably, you
sure that
not merely
the Municipal Court
in the Reasons
Book why all whether
Munisamappa paid the
money when the facts
distinctly asserted?

21-12

Submitted Swamy

Munisawmappa was the first
purchaser. His deposit money
was returned to him, when the
President cancelled the sale at which
he happened to be the highest
bidder. The object of the query
is whether, subsequent to the
date of Court order confirming
the 1st sale, money was
recovered from the 1st purchaser
Munisawmappa credited to Govt

S.M. 21/12/90

44

1898-99.

6487
12-1-1900

16

From

THE PRESIDENT,

*Bangalore City Municipality.*

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,

*General and Revenue Departments,*

BANGALORE.

L. F. S.
12-1-1900

K Moodbidri 8 1 00

Dated 8th January 1900

Despatched 10th

Received 9th

General No. 115 } 38-99
No. 12

*Enclosure No.*

Secretary's Docket No
7312 / 7598 of 23 December 99
Calling for information
as to whether the price of
the land near Kumbar-
goody referred to was received from
Sriman Narasimhappa
& credited to the Treasury.

Stating that the price
of the land referred to
in the above was received
and credited to Trea
Sury on the 25th Augt 99
To the same 4240 / 7598

16
a

Office of the Municipal Commission,

City, Bangalore, 8th January 1900

No. 14/5

8 & 12

From

THE PRESIDENT,

*Municipal Commission,*

BANGALORE CITY.

*To*

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,

*General and Revenue Departments,*

BANGALORE.

*Sir,*

With reference to your Docket No. $\frac{Y\,3\,1\,2}{S-98}$ dated 23d ultimo, I have the honor to state that the price of the land near Kumbargundi referred to, viz Rs 1075/-, was recovered from Sivanani Ramiswamappah on the 24th August 1898 and credited to Municipal Funds under X "Miscellaneous - Sale of house and lands" on the 25th idem and included in the sum of Rs 1318-6-11 remitted to the Treasury on the latter date.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servt

(Sd) [illegible]
President

46

Read:

Section 2nd (17)
No 38-98

Correspondence ending with

Docket etc 115 dated 8th January 1900 from the President of the Bangalore City municipal Commission in regard to the refund ~~of~~ of Rs 1200, ~~in favour of~~ ~~payable~~ to the heirs of one Kunnabba, to whom a piece of municipal land had been sold ~~at the sale~~ the sale ~~of~~ on 3rd March 1898, ~~which~~ being subsequently cancelled by Government Proc etc 1966 dated 10-8-98 R L 1081

Order thereon No 8340-41 dated 19/11/00 L 75-98

The refund bill for Rs 1200 received with the above is sanctioned and forwarded to the Auditor, for audit. The President is requested to look out the source in the current year's municipal Budget of the

15122 dated 19-8-98 and etc
L 7303 98

From the P Bl: city:
Rs 1200-98 20/1/00 L 1178

47

from which the change

can be met

11/17.10

Secretary

Aug 16 '05

To.

The President, Banga

City and Co

Comptroller with respects

bill

24.1.1900

J.V.H Dng 25-1-00

7027 1898-99. d 117

24-1-900

From

THE PRESIDENT,

*Bangalore City Municipality.*

*To*

THE SECRETARY TO THE

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,

*General and Revenue Departments,*

BANGALOR

*Dated* 20th January 1900

*Despatched* 22nd January 1900

*Received* - 38-98

General No. 125 } 18
No. - - - } - - -

*Enclosure No.*

Government Proceedings No. 8340-1 dated 2.7.8-98 19. Instant requesting to point out the source from which the refund of Rs 1200/- payable to the heirs of one Kandappa Can be met.

Stating that the Charge may be met out of the sum of Rs 1635/- provided in the Current Years Budget under II Head Office charges

No. dated 8-6-34 (1934-35) 11

49

17 Contributions
Account of Enlarge-
-ments in the Dew
and Confirmation &c

50

Office of the Municipal Commission,

City, Bangalore, 20th January 189 1901

11

From

THE PRESIDENT,

Municipal Commission,

BANGALORE CITY.

8 & 14

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,

General and Revenue Department

BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No. 8340-1 / L.F. 5-98 dated 19th Instant sanctioning the refund of Rs 1200/- payable to the heirs of one Kunnappa, I have the honor to state that the Charge may be met out of the sum of Rs 1636/- provided in the current year's Budget under "II Head office Charges - 17 — Contribution on account of Establishment in the Dewan's and Comptroller's offices" the cost of which has, under Government Proceedings No. 7605-13 / L.F. 67-97 dated 4th Instant, been ordered to

to be debited entirely to Provincial
Funds from the 1st. July 1899.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obedient Servant

[signature]
For President

5-c

Rd 38-99 16

Read Letter No 125 of 20th January 1900 from the President of the Bangalore City Municipal Commission stating that the Sum of Rs 120 the refund of which was sanctioned in Gov. No. 8340-1 / 175-98 of 19th January 1900, may be met from the Sum of Rs 1635/- provided under "II- Head office charges,- 17 contribution on account of establishment in the Dewan's and Comptroller's offices" in the current year's budget of the Bangalore City Mc.

R L1105

order thereon - No 8613-84 / 175-98 / 8/11/00

Approved.

Secy to Govt

To the President of the Bangalore City Municipal Commissioner Comptroller